



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,980	10/21/2003	Kenneth P. Sundermeyer	47583/P041US/10311286	4705

59061 7590 02/27/2006

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP (ADOBE)
2200 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 2800
DALLAS, TX 75201-2784

EXAMINER

RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/690,980		SUNDERMEYER ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Amelia Rutledge		2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 12/02/2005.
2. Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakao, U.S. Patent No. 6,061,697, issued May 2000, in view of Brown et al. (hereinafter "Brown"), U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0177321, published September 2004.**

Independent claim 1 cites: *A method to restrict editing in a tag-delimited, multi-formatted document comprising: parsing said multi-formatted document; identifying a plurality of tags responsive to said parsing; generating a revised document based on said multi-formatted document;*

Nakao teaches a SGML document editing apparatus which is implemented with a method of parsing a formatted SGML document (Col. 5, l. 5-22; Col. 7, l. 13-25) and identifying a plurality of editable tags in the document (Col. 9, l. 1-45). Nakao teaches generating a revised document based on the formatted SGML document, and a method of keeping a revision history of either portions of the document or the entire document (Col. 7, l. 13-25; Col. 20, l. 25-36).

Claim 1 also cites: *inserting one or more restriction tags into said revised document delimiting non-editable content defined by one or more of said plurality of tags; and restricting edit functions of a page editor responsive to said page editor reading said one or more restriction tags.*

Nakao teaches a detailed method of inserting restriction tags into a DTD for the revised document delimiting non-editable content defined by the tags (Col. 12, l. 10-Col. 14, l. 67) and restricting edit functions of a page editor responsive to the editor reading the restriction tags (Claim 14). While Nakao teaches use of a DTD, Nakao does not explicitly teach inserting restriction tags into the revised document, however, Brown teaches a method of inserting restriction tags into the editable, i.e., revised, document (p. 9, par. 107-p. 10, par. 109) including instance level restrictions. Brown teaches a method of creating a bounding DTD to restrict editing of a formatted structured document similar to the editing DTD of Nakao, however, whereas Nakao teaches the steps of creating the DTD, Brown explicitly teaches the steps of inserting the tags into the editable document (p. 8, par. 94-p. 9, par. 105). Both inventions are directed toward restricting editing operations on structured documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brown to Nakao, so that the user would have the benefit of techniques that enable application developers to have some control over what users can do when editing a structured document file (Brown p. 2, par. 21).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Nakao teaches compiling a list of document locations containing editable content defined by said one or more of said plurality of tags (Fig. 12; Col. 14, l. 45-61).

Regarding dependent claim 3, while Nakao does not explicitly teach hiding the restriction tags, Brown teaches a method of creating a bounding DTD to restrict editing of a formatted structured document (p. 5, par. 59). Brown teaches hiding of restriction tags so that the user of a page editor cannot see the tags during editing (p. 6, par. 72). Both inventions are directed toward restricting editing operations on structured documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brown to Nakao, so that the user would have the benefit of techniques that enable application developers to have some control over what users can do when editing a structured document file (Brown p. 2, par. 21).

Regarding dependent claims 4 and 5, Nakao teaches setting a restriction flag in said revised document to activate edit restriction, by adding a special symbol to denote editing restriction (Col. 11, l. 8-35). Nakao teaches that restriction is activated when the restriction flag is parsed. Nakao also teaches locking and unlocking editing permission in a document portion.

Regarding dependent claim 6, while Nakao does not explicitly teach presenting a notification to a user of said restricted editing responsive to a user attempting to edit a location delimited by said one or more restriction tags, Brown teaches the use of shading to notify the user of a restrictive editing location (p. 7, par. 80). Both inventions are directed toward restricting editing operations on structured

Art Unit: 2176

documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brown to Nakao, so that the user would have the benefit of techniques that enable application developers to have some control over what users can do when editing a structured document file (Brown p. 2, par. 21).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Nakao teaches stripping out the restriction tags when said page editor writes said edited multi-formatted document for presentation, because the partial editing DTD is not applied to the presentation document but allows independent parsing of the editable document (Col. 6, l. 50-54). This allows the output of an edited document with or without history information (), i.e., stripped tags (Col. 7, l. 25-35).

In regard to independent claim 8, Nakao teaches a SGML document editing apparatus which is implemented with a method of parsing a formatted SGML document (Col. 5, l. 5-22; Col. 7, l. 13-25) and identifying a plurality of editable tags in the document (Col. 9, l. 1-45); compare to claim 8, *code for parsing said multi-formatted document, wherein said each of said multiple formats is delimited in said multi-formatted document by one or more descriptive labels; code for analyzing said one or more descriptive labels*. Nakao teaches generating a revised document based on the formatted SGML document, and a method of keeping a revision history of either portions of the document or the entire document (Col. 7, l. 13-25; Col. 20, l. 25-36), compare to *code for generating a modified document using content of said multi-formatted document*. Nakao teaches a detailed method of inserting restriction tags into a DTD for the revised document delimiting non-editable content defined by the tags

Art Unit: 2176

(Col. 12, l. 10-Col. 14, l. 67) and restricting edit functions of a page editor responsive to the editor reading the restriction tags (Claim 14).

While Nakao teaches use of a DTD, Nakao does not explicitly teach inserting restriction tags into the revised document, however, Brown teaches a method of inserting restriction tags into the editable, i.e., revised, document (p. 9, par. 107-p. 10, par. 109) including instance level restrictions, to be processed by a document editor, compare to *code for inserting a prohibition label in said modified document around each instance of non-editable content as defined by said one or more descriptive labels; and code for prohibiting edit functions of a document editor responsive to said prohibition labels*. Brown teaches a method of creating a bounding DTD to restrict editing of a formatted structured document similar to the editing DTD of Nakao, however, whereas Nakao teaches the steps of creating the DTD, Brown explicitly teaches the steps of inserting the tags into the editable document (p. 8, par. 94-p. 9, par. 105). Both inventions are directed toward restricting editing operations on structured documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brown to Nakao, so that the user would have the benefit of techniques that enable application developers to have some control over what users can do when editing a structured document file (Brown p. 2, par. 21).

Regarding dependent claims 9-14, claims 9-14 reflect substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claims 2-7, being directed to the computer program product used to implement the methods as claimed in dependent claims 2-7, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Independent claim 15 cites: *A method to restrict editing of a Web document comprising: parsing said Web document; analyzing a plurality of markup tags within said Web document; generating a substitute Web document with content of said Web document; inserting one or more restriction markup tags in said substitute Web document demarcating non-editable content items defined by one or more of said plurality of markup tags; and restricting edit functions of a Web editor responsive to said one or more restriction markup tags.*

Nakao teaches a SGML document editing apparatus, i.e., a Web document editor, which is implemented with a method of parsing a formatted SGML document (Col. 5, l. 5-22; Col. 7, l. 13-25) and identifying a plurality of editable tags in the document (Col. 9, l. 1-45). Nakao teaches generating a revised document based on the formatted SGML document, and a method of keeping a revision history of either portions of the document or the entire document (Col. 7, l. 13-25; Col. 20, l. 25-36). Nakao teaches a detailed method of inserting restriction tags into a DTD for the revised document delimiting non-editable content defined by the tags (Col. 12, l. 10-Col. 14, l. 67) and restricting edit functions of a page editor responsive to the editor reading the restriction tags (Claim 14).

While Nakao teaches use of a DTD, Nakao does not explicitly teach inserting restriction tags into the revised document, however, Brown teaches a method of inserting restriction tags into the editable, i.e., revised, document (p. 9, par. 107-p. 10, par. 109) including instance level restrictions, to be processed by a document editor. Brown teaches a method of creating a bounding DTD to restrict editing of a formatted

Art Unit: 2176

structured document similar to the editing DTD of Nakao, however, whereas Nakao teaches the steps of creating the DTD, Brown explicitly teaches the steps of inserting the tags into the editable document (p. 8, par. 94-p. 9, par. 105). Both inventions are directed toward restricting editing operations on structured documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brown to Nakao, so that the user would have the benefit of techniques that enable application developers to have some control over what users can do when editing a structured document file (Brown p. 2, par. 21).

Regarding dependent claims 16-21, claims 16-21 reflect substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claims 2-7, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Independent claim 22 cites: *A system for preserving design elements of a Web page during content editing, said system comprising: a Web development environment comprising: a parsing engine for analyzing a plurality of Web page markup tags; a list of restriction tags for insertion around said design elements, as defined by one or more of said plurality of Web page markup tags; and a page editor comprising: a plurality of deselectable editing functions, wherein said deselection is responsive to said restriction tags.*

Nakao teaches a SGML document editing apparatus which is implemented with a method of parsing a formatted SGML document (Col. 5, l. 5-22; Col. 7, l. 13-25) and identifying a plurality of editable tags in the document (Col. 9, l. 1-45). Nakao teaches a list of restriction tags for insertion around formatting elements. While Nakao teaches a

Art Unit: 2176

page editor, Nakao does not explicitly teach a page editor comprising a plurality of deselectable editing functions, where deselection is responsive to restriction tags. However, Brown teaches a web development environment and page editor with deselectable editing functions responsive to the restriction tags (p. 6, par. 72; p. 7, par. 80). Both inventions are directed toward restricting editing operations on structured documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brown to Nakao, so that the user would have the benefit of techniques that enable application developers to have some control over what users can do when editing a structured document file (Brown p. 2, par. 21).

Regarding dependent claim 23, Nakao teaches a method of parsing a formatted SGML document (Col. 5, l. 5-22; Col. 7, l. 13-25) and identifying a plurality of editable tags in the document (Col. 9, l. 1-45); compare to: *a Web page is processed by said Web development environment to obtain said restriction tags*.

Regarding dependent claim 24, while Nakao does not explicitly teach that a subject matter expert operates said page editor to perform said content editing, Brown teaches that the editing system is designed for both application developers and users, where the users operate the restrictive page editor (p. 2, par. 21). The users taught by brown correspond to subject matter experts and would include that group. Both inventions are directed toward restricting editing operations on structured documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brown to Nakao, so that the user would have the benefit of techniques that enable

application developers to have some control over what users can do when editing a structured document file (Brown p. 2, par. 21).

Regarding dependent claim 26, while Nakao does not explicitly teach a restriction switch, Brown teaches a restriction switch for deselecting editing functionality (Figure 14) compare to *a restriction switch, accessible by said Web development environment, for activating deselectability of said plurality of deselectable editing functions*.

5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakao in view of Brown as applied to claims 1-24 and 26 above, and further in view of Judson, U.S. Patent No. 5,752,643, issued November 1996.

Regarding dependent claim 25, while Nakao in view of Brown does not explicitly teach a cover object for obscuring the restriction tags from view, Judson teaches hiding tags in HTML comment tags and/or by the creation of a covering tag to obscure another tag from view (Col. 5, l. 16-40), compare to *a cover object for obscuring said restriction tags from view in said page editor*.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12/02/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. While applicant argues that the combination of Nakao and Brown does not teach the limitations of claim 1 and dependent claims 2-7 (Remarks, p. 6-8), applicant's arguments depend on partial, piecemeal citations of the reference passages

Art Unit: 2176

cited in the first Office Action rather than reading the cited passages in their entirety.

In response to applicant's arguments in regard to claim 1 that Nakao does not teach the limitation *identifying a plurality of tags*, Nakao does indeed teach identifying a plurality of tags as was cited on page 2 of the first Office Action (Col. 9, l. 1-45), specifically in the following passages: *the SGML information of a particular document element comprises a tag...* (Col. 9, l. 7-8), and: *Each element of a document is stored in a database. Each element is assigned an instance identifier and managed* (Col. 9, l. 11-13). It was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that a SGML element was also known as a "tag". Because Nakao teaches that each element, i.e., tag, of a document was assigned an instance identifier, Nakao teaches identifying a plurality of tags.

7. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually (Remarks, p. 6-13), one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Specifically, in regard to claim 1, Nakao teaches a detailed method of inserting restriction tags into a DTD for the revised document delimiting non-editable content defined by the tags (Col. 12, l. 10-Col. 14, l. 67) and restricting edit functions of a page editor responsive to the editor reading the restriction tags (Claim 14). While Nakao teaches inserting restriction tags into a DTD, Nakao does not explicitly teach inserting restriction tags into the revised document, however, Brown teaches a method of inserting restriction tags into the editable, i.e., revised, document

Art Unit: 2176

(p. 9, par. 107-p. 10, par. 109) including instance level restrictions. Brown teaches a method of creating a bounding DTD to restrict editing of a formatted structured document similar to the editing DTD of Nakao, however, whereas Nakao teaches the steps of creating the DTD, Brown also explicitly teaches the steps of inserting the tags into the editable document (p. 8, par. 94-p. 9, par. 105). Brown also teaches restricting the edit functions of the page editor responsive to the editor reading restrictive tags (p. 10, par. 108-198). Therefore, the combination of Nakao with Brown does teach each and every limitation of claim 1.

8. Further, both inventions are directed toward restricting editing operations on structured documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Brown to Nakao, so that the user would have the benefit of techniques that enable application developers to have some control over what users can do when editing a structured document file (Brown p. 2, par. 21). Both Nakao and Brown disclose similar methods to achieve the purpose of document editing restriction, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the two.

9. Applicant argues regarding claim 8 and dependent claims 9-14 that Nakao does not teach the limitations *code for analyzing said one or more descriptive labels;.... code for inserting a prohibition label in said modified document around each instance of non-editable content....* (Remarks, p. 8-10). It is respectfully noted that applicant's arguments hinge upon the distinction between a "tag" and a "label". However, it was

Art Unit: 2176

well known in the art at the time of the invention that “tag” and “label” were equivalent terms.

10. Applicant argues regarding claim 15 and dependent claims 16-21 and claim 22 and dependent claims 23-26 are substantially similar to the arguments for claims 1 and 8 and their dependent claims, and for the same reasons, are not persuasive.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amelia Rutledge whose telephone number is 571-272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100